☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _8-2-99_   .

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire _____3_____ month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) _1-28_ _____ is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) _1-28_ _____ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐approved ☐disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____ .

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- *SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES* ---

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment A, filed on 08/02/99.

This action is made final.

2.   Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 16 and 21 are independent claims.

3.   The present title of the application is "Method and apparatus for providing a personal

page."

4.   The rejection of claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable

over Wesinger, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,778,367, filed 12/1995, class 707/10, title

"Automated on-line information service and directory, particularly for the World Wide Web", in

view of DuFresne, U.S. Patent Number 5,835,712, filed 05/1996, class 395/200.33, title "Client-

server system using embedded hypertext tags for application and database development", has been

withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

6. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Wesinger, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,778,367, filed 12/1995, class 707/10, title "Automated on-line information service and directory, particularly for the World Wide Web", in view of DuFresne, U.S. Patent Number 5,835,712, filed 05/1996, class 395/200.33, title "Client-server system using embedded hypertext tags for application and database development" and further in view of LDS, LDS Singles Connections, singles.ids.net, pp.1-2.

With respect to independent claim 1, **Wesinger, Jr. et al.** discloses "prompting a page-creating remote user with a plurality of page templates for the personal page and receiving a template selection from the remote user" ("a user visits the site and the WebWho option is selected, a page WebWho.html . . . is served to the user, offering the user various options . . ."--column 10, line 38) "prompting the page-creating remote user to enter text to the personal page and receiving entered text from the remote user" ("add a new entry, update an existing entry . . ."--column 10, line 41) "storing attributes representing each selection or entry made by the page-creating remote user in one or more databases" ("entries from the users containing the information to be electronically published . . . classified and stored in the database . . ."--abstract) "providing the page-creating remote user with means to input security parameters for the personal page, the security parameters specifying authorization of at least one other remote user to access

are allowed to view your profile . . ."--page 1 of 2). It would have been obvious at the time of the

invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of LDS "displaying

the personal page upon request only to remote users who are authorized to access the personal

page" ("user-defined visibility screening . . . you determine which members are allowed to view

your profile . . ."--page 1 of 2) with the teachings of Wesinger, Jr. et al. above, because using the

steps of "displaying the personal page upon request to page-viewing remote users who are

authorized to access the personal page", give those skilled in the art the tools to control the

viewing privileges of data to users in a networking environment.

With respect to dependent claim 2, **Wesinger, Jr. et al.** does not disclose "wherein each

page template is stored as a plurality of rows in one or more databases on the computer system."

DuFresne discloses "wherein each page template is stored as a plurality of rows in one or more

databases on the computer system" ("each template also includes an identification field for

entering the template . . .the template and content databases . . ."--column 4, line). It would have

been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the

teachings of DuFresne "wherein each page template is stored as a plurality of rows in one or more

databases on the computer system" ("each template also includes an identification field for

entering the template . . . the template and content databases . . ."--column 4, line) with the

teachings of Wesinger, Jr. et al. above, because using the step of "wherein each page template is

stored as a plurality of rows in one or more databases on the computer system", allow those

skilled in the art to be able use and store page templates relating to database data.

the personal page" ("allowing users to retrieve and update entries by supplying a correct

password . . ."--abstract) "storing the security parameters in one or more databases" ("input is

accepted from the individual users . . . stored in the database . . ."--column 2, line 63).

Wesinger, Jr. et al. does not disclose "prompting the page-creating remote user to select or

enter graphical information to display on the personal page and receiving the selection or entry

from the remote user." DuFresne discloses "prompting the page-creating remote user to select

or enter graphical information to display on the personal page and receiving the selection or entry

from the remote user" ("an input query to the client to input a user . . ."--column 4, line 46). It

would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to have

combined the teachings of DuFresne "prompting the page-creating remote user to select or enter

graphical information to display on the personal page and receiving the selection or entry from the

remote user" ("an input query to the client to input a user . . ."--column 4, line 46) with teachings

of Wesinger above, because using the steps of "prompting the page-creating remote user to select

or enter graphical information to display on the personal page and receiving the selection or entry

from the remote user" would have given those skilled in the art the benefit of prompting an user

to indicate information about their location. This would allow on-line users to search and locate

users in certain areas. Wesinger, Jr. et al. does not disclose "displaying the personal page upon

request to page-viewing remote users who are authorized to access the personal page." LDS

discloses "displaying the personal page upon request only to remote users who are authorized to

access the personal page" ("user-defined visibility screening . . . you determine which members

With respect to dependent claim 3, **Wesinger, Jr. et al.** does not disclose "wherein at least one row for each page template provides the overall layout of the personal page." **DuFresne** discloses "wherein at least one row for each page template provides the overall layout of the personal page" ("each template specifies what information from the database a corresponding output Web page should contain and how the page should look . . ."--column 9, line 51). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of DuFresne "wherein at least one row for each page template provides the overall layout of the personal page" ("each template specifies what information from the database a corresponding output Web page should contain and how the page should look . . ."--column 9, line 51) with the teachings of Wesinger, Jr. et al. above, because using the steps of "wherein at least one row for each page template provides the overall layout of the personal page" offer those skilled in the art the advantage of producing structure information of pages in a networking environment.

With respect to dependent claim 4, **Wesinger, Jr. et al.** discloses "wherein at least one row for each page template corresponds to a field in the page template for receiving a remote user selection or entry" ("entries from the users containing the information to be electronically publisher . . ."--abstract).

With respect to dependent claim 5, **Wesinger, Jr. et al.** does not disclose "wherein the attributes stored in one or more databases are each stored in a row corresponding to a field in the page template." **DuFresne** discloses "wherein the attributes stored in one or more databases are

each stored in a row corresponding to a field in the page template" ("each item in a template, such as the ID field 91 and access control fields 92 . . . item in a template and the 'value' is the corresponding data record held by that field . . ."--column 9, line 55). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of DuFresne "wherein the attributes stored in one or more databases are each stored in a row corresponding to a field in the page template" ("each item in a template, such as the ID field 91 and access control fields 92 . . . item in a template and the 'value' is the corresponding data record held by that field . . ."--column 9, line 55) with the teachings of Wesinger above, because using the step of "wherein the attributes stored in one or more databases are each stored in a row corresponding to a field in the page template", give those skilled in the art the tools to correlate data attributes in a database with templates data in an networking environment.

With respect to dependent claim 6, **Wesinger, Jr. et al.** discloses "wherein the graphics attribute stored represents the location of the graphics file selected or entered by the remote user" ("the automated information service and directory is used, screen displays of the graphical user interface . . . providing a graphical front end . . ."--column 4, line 36).

With respect to dependent claim 7, **Wesinger, Jr. et al.** discloses "wherein the row corresponding to the overall layout of the page template includes HTML code describing the page template layout" ("where the page description language is HTML and the computer network is the World Wide Web . . ."--abstract).

With respect to dependent claim 8, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the

arguments given above for rejected independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-7. In dependent

claim 8, Applicant claims a method which contains steps corresponding to the method of rejected

independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-7.

With respect to dependent claim 9, **Wesinger, Jr. et al.** discloses "wherein only graphics

having a smaller storage size than a predetermined storage size may be entered by a user"

("wherein the user classifications include textual and graphical user classifications"--column 14,

line 64).

With respect to independent claims 10, 16 and 21 and dependent claims 11-15, 17-20 and

22, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected

independent claims 1 and dependent claims 2-9. In independent claims 10, 16 and 21 and

dependent claims 11-15, 17-20 and 22, Applicant claims a method, computer readable code and

method which contains steps corresponding to the method of rejected independent claims 1 and

dependent claims 2-9.

With respect to dependent claim 23 and 24, this claim is rejected on grounds

corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected independent claim 1 and dependent

claims 2 and are similarly rejected.

With respect to dependent claim 25, **Wessinger, Jr. et al.** "wherein the page-creating user

may grant authorization to view the personal page to another remote user when sending an

electronic mail message to that other remote user" (figure 20 teaches the use of personal email"--

sheet 17 of 25).

With respect to dependent claim 26-28, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to

the arguments given above for rejected independent claim 1 and dependent claim 25 and are

similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

7.   ***Applicant's arguments filed 8/2/99 have been fully considered but they are not***

persuasive.

With respect to Applicant's arguments concerning "Wessinger Jr. does not restrict

viewing of the mini homepages . . .", have been fully considered but they are deemed unpersuasive

in view of the original ground of rejection. Examiner contends that Wessinger Jr.'s teachings

"entries are password protected allowing users to retrieve and update entries . . ." could be

considered a means to restrict the viewing of a HTML page, because without the correct

password a user cannot access information on a HTML page.

With respect to Applicant's arguments concerning "DuFresne does not allow users,

especially non-technical users, to create personal pages having user input text and images and

restrict viewing of the page to authorized system . . .", have been fully considered by they are

deemed moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8.   Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703)-308-9051 (**formal** communications intended for entry),

Or:

(703)-308-5403 (**informal** communications labeled **PROPOSED** or **DRAFT**).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Sixth Floor Receptionist, Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to

Alford Kindred, whose telephone number is (703)-305-3802 and can normally be reached

Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Mike Razavi, can be reached at (703)-305-4713.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-305-3900.

AWK

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER